



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which tend to invite further foreign interference. The author's account of the attitude of the American opinion towards Japan and Russia during the war is very informing, in that it shows the influence of historic relations and of literature upon national predilections. Although he deals with Russian policy only incidentally, his opinion of the exclusive economic system inaugurated in Manchuria before the war is by no means favorable.

Mr. Hishida's treatise is a historical account of the international relations of Japan. The history of Japan has not yet been scientifically sifted, and the author occasionally does not distinguish between tradition and history as in the case of the exploits of the Empress Jingo in Korea. He, however, makes good use of reliable secondary materials and gives a clear and interesting historical account. The more recent events are dealt with more directly from the sources, and the author gives a very satisfactory and impartial account of the treaty revision, as well as of the Korean question and the negotiations leading up to the war. Unhappily, however, he slurs over the part which the Japanese *soshi* played in the murder of the queen of Korea. The discussion of Korean neutrality and independence is satisfactory. The author does not go so far as some English authors in regarding the Korean protectorate as dating from before the war, and he cites with approval the opinion of Nakamura who regarded Korea as a *de facto* ally of Japan. He believes that the political interest of Japan in east Asia far transcends that of any European power, and states that Japan would be ready to assist Siam in maintaining its independence. Japan is disposed to defend China, "but should the Chinese again enter upon a course offensive to western civilization, Japan would coöperate with the Christian powers, as she did in 1900." This book, as do the others, shows that the times are past when Japan can be looked upon as an æsthetic plaything; at present she must be regarded as one of those great powers, whose actions are determined by national interests not always harmonious with each other.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

Liberty, Union and Democracy. By BARRETT WENDELL. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. Pp. 327.)

The work includes three essays on the subjects that form the general title, together with a prefatory essay on the National Character of America. The subjects are attractive to students of political

science; the treatment is not. The type is the familiar one of the patriotic sermon: we are a great people, of reverend ancestry, and we should try to live up to the noble ideals of our history.

It is interesting to note the transformations that facts undergo under the stress of this hortatory purpose. On p. 94, patriotic devotion to the flag, that "now seems so instinctive as to be among the laws of nature," is referred to in connection with a historic incident showing "how little it was developed in Revolutionary times." But on p. 105, we are told that "from the very beginning, as every tradition of the Revolution must remind us, the flag of our country has been held to symbolize Liberty;" also, "to symbolize, as well, the ideal of Union;" also, "from beginning, too, as we may remind ourselves by searching wherever we will, throughout our national literature—and for that matter, throughout our public utterances, memorable and trivial alike—it has been held to symbolize the ideal of democracy." But, on p. 184, we are told that when the "Union emblem" was first displayed "floating above the insurgent lines at Cambridge * * * the ideal of American Union could have possessed no such reverend quality, no such sacred and stirring power, as some of us now imagine to have been inherent in its always." Again, on p. 186, we are informed that "to Union sentiment, nowadays, of course, the United States of America is a term which seems to assert our almost divinely sanctioned national unity; but taken by itself, as it was written in that same year, 1776, when Washington had first hoisted the Union flag at Cambridge, it involves, so far as I can see, no necessary suggestion of anything more than a temporary alliance."

How can these various assertions be reconciled? It is evident, that they are not meant to be regarded as statements of fact. They are rhetorical outbursts, like the pyrotechnic gush of a Roman candle, meant for sparkling display, and not to give light to see by.

The filio-pietistic frame of mind is frequently in evidence. We are told that "the fathers of New England were intellectually active to a degree which did not disturb the repose of their contemporaries to the southward. They wrote and published copiously." It may be admitted that the degree of their intellectual activity did not disturb the repose of their contemporaries anywhere, but if what is meant is that early New England was a scene of fruitful, literary activity, against this opinion may be set the critical judgment expressed by Charles Francis Adams in his essay, entitled *Massachusetts: Its*

Historians and Its History. The conclusion at which he arrived was that New England claims to literary eminence date no farther back than 1835. It describes the literary activity which then began as a growth springing up after the melting of the theological glacier that had sterilized the New England intellect for 135 years previously. According to Professor Wendell (p. 72) "the vital origin of our national temper * * * can be traced to the instinctive idealism of pre-revolutionary England, strengthened and defined by the intensely orderly idealism ingrained in those who faithfully accepted the Calvinistic creed." What to Mr. Adams appeared to be a glacier, arresting development, to Professor Wendell appears to be a germinal influence. Which is right? Mr. Adams submits evidence. Professor Wendell does not. Facts are stubborn things and are decidedly inconvenient to those who still find pleasure in writing history as a New England serenade.

An invidious sectionalism is strongly marked in the work. We are told (p. 142) that "almost unperceived, the appeal to general Northern emotion of the separate State in which a citizen chanced to reside became less and less insistent; the appeal of the United States became stronger." When? Was this the case in the days of the Hartford convention? We are further told that in this alleged development of Northern sentiment, "there came to associate itself with the name of Liberty, still ardently and traditionally cherished, an increasing degree of insistence on the liberty of the individual." But on the very next page, "the prohibition laws, so general throughout the North," are referred to as "an arbitrary supervision of personal conduct unsurpassed in any despotism." Puzzle: how can the particular case be reconciled with the general statement?

In discussing the growth of national sentiment, Professor Wendell (p. 182) illustrates it by comparing the union of States to the bonds of wedlock. He remarks: "Now, some similar conception, has tended, at least in the North, to sanction and sanctify our national ideal of Union." The sectional twist given to the remark becomes grotesque in view of comparative divorce statistics as between the North and the South. In general, sectional allusion in the work has a character which was once unfortunately prevalent, but which it is now surprising to find in a serious work of recent production.

Occasionally, one comes upon passages which seem to be almost in the vein of Jefferson Brick. For instance, we are told (p. 255),

"To Europe, the rule of the people means something gloriously Utopian. To America, this rule means something immemorially familiar." Does the rule of the people appear as merely gloriously Utopian to the people of Switzerland, for instance? A prefatory note says that the work has its origin in lectures delivered at the Sorbonne. One wonders whether the author made that statement to an audience of citizens of the French Republic. If so, it is to be feared that they may have imagined that scholarship in this country still lingers at the stage that gave point to Sir Henry Maine's reference to the "nauseous grandiloquence of the American panegyrical historian."

And yet, if one does not expect anything more than to be edified on conventional lines, one might well admire the literary polish of Professor Wendell's style, and obtain from the work a feeling of complacent satisfaction mingled with virtuous desire. Such results probably accomplish its purpose and set up the standard by which the performance invites judgment.

HENRY JONES FORD.

The National Liberal Federation: From its Commencement to the General Election of 1906. By ROBERT SPENCE WATSON, LL.D.

With an Introduction by the Rt. Hon. Augustine Birrell, K.C., M.P. (London: Fisher Unwin. 1907. Pp. xii, 318.)

One of the most obvious needs in the literature of political science today is a history of political parties in England in the nineteenth century. There are monographs covering phases of the subject such as Keble's *History of Toryism* (1886); Roylance Kent's *The English Radicals* (1889); and J. Bowles Daly's *The Dawn of Radicalism* (1892). But there exists no history of the tory party from the death of Pitt to the end of the late Lord Salisbury's premiership; nor is there any history of the evolution of the liberal party from the days of Fox, Grey, and Melbourne; from the time when the whigs were the dominating influence and the liberal party was in the ascendancy, to the days of the liberalism of Gladstone and Harcourt, and of Campbell-Bannerman and Morley.

What is needed is a work on the lines of Cooke's *History of Parties* (1840); a history that shall treat of both parties in the nineteenth century as Cooke treated of them in the eighteenth, and up to the end of the last unreformed House of Commons. Only in this way can the